REPORT

Seoul, Korea
7–10 June 2011

IPPC Open-Ended Working Group on Electronic Phytosanitary Certification

Produced by the Secretariat of the International Plant Protection Convention

1. OPENING OF THE MEETING

The representative of the Secretariat of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) opened the meeting by expressing IPPC's gratitude to the Republic of Korea for hosting and organizing the Open-Ended Working Group (OEWG) . He also thanked the Government of New-Zealand for funding the organization of the meeting, thanks to which the IPPC Secretariat could arrange for the attendance of participants from developing countries.

The Director General of the National Plant Quarantine Service of Korea, Mr In-Hong Yeo, welcomed all participants, thanked them for coming and expressed his gratitude to the Steering Committee and IPPC for organizing the meeting. He stressed that the introduction of phytosanitary eCertification is not an easy task but it is essential to facilitate trade, reduce costs and protect the global environment. He wished all participants successful work in establishing the next steps in the process.

The meeting was attended by 43 participants from 23 countries and 2 regional organizations (see Appendix 3).

2. OEWG OBJECTIVES

The IPPC representative presented the objectives of the OEWG and explained that eCertification is now part of the IPPC work program. Moreover, in March this year, the CPM adopted the ISPM°12.2011. *Phytosanitary certificates*, a revision of ISPM°12:2001, explicitly mentioning the electronic certification and agreeing on a blank appendix for information on electronic certification. He also raised the question whether we should use the word "ePhyto" for Phytosanitary Electronic Certification instead of the word "eCertification" which is also used for other purposes. The objectives presented to the OEWG are described below.

2.1. General Objective

To determine needs to be developed so that a standardized phytosanitary electronic certification system is defined for implementation between NPPOs.

2.2. Specific objectives

- To determine the standardized contents (data elements) of the electronic phytosanitary certificate.
- To determine the standardized process of a secure and authentic transmission of the electronic phytosanitary certificate from an exporting NPPO to an importing NPPO.
- To determine how to get the standardized elements of electronic phytosanitary certification accepted and widely used.
- To determine how to make the standardized elements of electronic phytosanitary certification available to all NPPOs.
- To determine the necessary elements for a smooth transition from paper to electronic certificates.
- To establish a work program and organize an international forum for 2011-2012 to face all challenges identified during the meeting, with the ultimate aim of producing a draft Appendix to ISPM 12:2011.

2.3. Decisions

- Contents of the XML message
- Transmission of the message

- Communication on harmonized elements
- Smooth transition.

3. WORSHOPS'OBJECTIVES: BREAKOUT SESSION ON ATTENDEES' EXPECTATIONS

In small groups, participants introduced themselves and discussed their expectations from the working group. The outcome of these small groups was then presented in a plenary session. Many of participants' expectations were in line with the objectives of the Working Group indicated above. There was some concern on how to deal with eCertification in re-export situations and a general agreement on initiating the harmonization process of eCertification before countries start developing their own systems. Most of participants were expecting follow up actions by the Working Group through a detailed work plan and a clear time-schedule

Some participants also stressed the following points:

- more information on budget and funding for an ePhyto system
- re-export topic should be thoroughly discussed during the week
- learning how to deal with multi-lateral eCertification or ePhyto systems
- ensuring usefulness of the system for all countries and that a single standardized system be created and adopted
- more clarity on how to start a ePhyto system
- more interactions with certification at local level; and
- harmonization of products and plants descriptions.

3.1. General Principles

Mr Peter Johnston (New Zealand) presented some general principles of eCertification. It is important to note that eCertification is between NPPOs, whereas trade is currently handing over the phytosanitary certificate in paper form to the NPPO of the importing country. The paper certificate plays an important role in trade and, in the near future, it will be continued to use for many purposes. It is for this reason that stakeholders should be involved in the introduction of eCertification and NPPOs should learn from each other's experience. Authentication is central to the process and a simple system transaction is needed. Trade will continue to require hard copies of phytosanitary certificates to facilitate their commercial relationships. Therefore, paper copies will still be needed in the near future.

Standardized e-certification is also essential. Initial costs are high but efficiency gains are large.

3.2. Ottawa Meeting

A representative from Canada summarized the objectives and the results of the 2009 Ottawa meeting on eCertification. During this meeting a general accepted idea on what electronic phytosanitary certification is, and what it is not was developed and a definition for Electronic Phytosanitary Certification was formulated. It was agreed that ISPM 12:2011 and the XML Schema of the United Nations Centre for Trade Facilitation and Electronic Business (UN/CEFACT) would be the basis and that eCertification could only be developed effectively multilaterally rather than bilaterally. Working groups had been set up to continue to operate after the Ottawa meeting but unfortunately not as much progress had been made as anticipated. The meeting also included industry participation.

Nine decisions were made regarding the development of eCertification:

i) agreement on the definition of Electronic Phytosanitary Certification
ii) all elements for electronic phytosanitary certification exchange mechanism will be derived from ISPM 12:2011
iii) universally accepted standards for securing certificate exchange, message format, and implementation of exchange procedures will be used
iv) UN/CEFACT Schema (data elements, core components) must be reviewed to ensure consistency with ISPM 12:2011 requirements and a user guide developed to include an ISPM 12:2011. Overlay for the UN/CEFACT Schema' (an ISPM 12:2011specific schema imposing business restrictions on the UN/CEFACT Schema)
v) during transition periods, current hard-copy practice would still apply
vi) to rely on IT experts to provide advice on methods for flexible and safe electronic transfer
vii) To initiate a multilateral standardization approach rather than a bilateral approach with respect to country-to-country negotiations for exchange
viii) to engage developing countries through regional cooperation and pilot projects and use IPPC for outreach activities and
ix) to develop simple-to-understand communication pieces such as a background paper and "myth-busting" Questions and Answers.

Three Working Groups were established with the aim of:

i) working on the external validation of NZ draft ISPM 12:2011 data map
ii) reviewing the business rules, and selecting a security transfer protocol
iii) developing a master list of botanical names and setting up a working group on these issues.

3.3. Countries Experiences

Korea, Kenya, Australia and Mexico shared their experiences on phytosanitary electronic certification and their future plans. All four countries are very active in setting up electronic certification and have a domestic electronic system to facilitate the issuance of phytosanitary certificates. Some of these countries are also ready to start sending electronic certificates or they are in a condition to verify paper certificates validity through an electronic database run by the NPPO of the importing country, thereby preventing fraud.

Some points that arose from these discussions included the following issues:

- Existing regulations of some countries do not allow for electronic certification or electronic exchange of official documentation, as a physical signature and stamp are not included.
- There will be a strong need for national capacity development for ePhyto.
- There is a need to engage other institutions when implementing the ePhyto system - e.g., industry and trade often require paper copies of the ePhyto to ensure financial transactions. The ePhyto system needs to be flexible enough to account for re-use of data by trade partners, e.g. re-export.
- The development of business intelligence from data contained in the ePhyto is important for a country.
- The availability of hardware and software platforms to host such a system may be lacking.
- Not all NPPO offices have internet connection to participate in an eCertification system.
- Many ePhyto systems are being developed as a sub-system of electronic certification systems that are primarily on animal products, health and food safety.

3.4. UN/CEFACT

UN/CEFACT developed a Sanitary and Phytosanitary XML Schema (SPS XML) for electronic certification. Ms Barbara Cooper, as Co-chair of the UN/CEFACT working group on phytosanitary certification, presented the process that led to the SPS XML Schema for phytosanitary certification. This SPS XML Schema is flexible and can be further improved in the future, leading to a newer version of the Schema. The most recent version is 10.a, which is not yet accessible via the UN/CEFACT website. However, the earlier versions of the schema can still be used.

It is envisaged that as ePhyto systems are implemented and countries gain more experience. In this respect, some modifications may be necessary to both the UN/CEFACT standard and the Appendix of ISPM 12:2011,

3.5. Korean Customs and Single Window Concept

Mrs. So-Young Yang of the Korean Custom Services (KCS) explained the developments of the World Custom Organisation (WCO) towards a "single window" approach and the adopted data standardisation process. Korea has implemented this single window approach successfully. Strong political support, active support from the private sector and phased implementation were essential components for the successful implementation. Data standardisation is a key success factor for the implementation of the single window approach and this is not always easy to achieve due to differences between countries.

It is clear that IPPC and World Customs Organization (WCO) should work together. This would require strategic commitment and CPM membership involvement.

3.6. XML Schema

New Zealand presented their method of using the UN/CEFACT SPS XML Schema to develop a XML data map for ePhyto, making it available to all interested parties. Emphasis was made on the fact that XML is designed to store data, rather than display them it would be accepted worldwide and allow automation - functionality.

The Netherlands showed how the UN/CEFACT is accessed as well as the dashboard leading to the e-certification project on the XML schema. The plant health certificate is used for mapping the information. In the process of ePhyto system design, it is very important to validate the UN/CEFACT SPS XML Schema data elements against the requirements of ISPM 12:2011 and import country requirements, and include a fall-back paper version.

The USA presented their website for electronic certification, commenting that all information comes out in XML format and that their system is ready to send messages in XML format. Currently they issue 500,000 certificates a year. New functionalities, recently added to their system, include: i) an export database with import requirements of all countries, able to be updated within minutes from receipt notification of change; ii) handling of fees and billing; iii) external certificate validation which allows foreign countries to verify validity of certificates; and iv) use of image as signature.

Some discussions regarding e-signature took place since the electronic version should exclude its use. What is really needed is the evidence that the ePhyto actually did come from that specific NPPO.

The USA and Canada shared use cases presentation on the application of business rules to the ePhyto XML schema. The UN/CEFACT SPS XML Schema was designed for all types of certification, including generic phytosanitary requirements but without specifics required for the application of ISPM 12:2011. The NAPPO eCertification's panel worked on a method for confirming the inclusion of ISPM 12:2011 requirements within the UN/CEFACT SPS XML Schema. Electronic validation of information would identify and reject those documents that are incomplete or invalid. The NAPPO panel is working on a unified method following ISO schema which would allow for automation of ISPM 12:2011 requirements / business rules. Original, withdrawn and replaced phytosanitary certificates were run through the system to detect what is required to make them ISPM 12:2011 compliant. There are many requirements within ISPM 12:2011 that are not mandatory in the UN/CEFACT SPS XML Schema. A list of outstanding questions that need to be addressed was provided.

A representative from the Netherlands introduced the topic of code lists, some of which can be generated through automation (e.g. ISO code list for countries), while others will have to be filled out manually. Disadvantages include code lists restrict options while among advantages, they increase accuracy in the gathering of business intelligence. A representative from New Zealand presented a list of 5,000 botanical names, without codes, while EPPO has a list of 20,000 verified and coded names. It was pointed out that code lists are not required on hard copy certificates, although coding helps streamlining ePhyto system development. It is thus recommended to adopt the same standardized list of codes which would have a global applicability.
A discussion was then briefly made on the real need for codes or whether the Latin name is sufficient. Other considerations were about the level of details required: e.g. *cultivar*.

Workshop participants from Canada and New Zealand reviewed ISPM 12:2011 with specific regards to product description and noted that a SPS trade line item was needed to include classifications for product (fruit/vegetable, fresh/dried, end use). Harmonized System (HS) codes could be used, although in some cases these do not go into the required details (e.g. Cut flowers). Additional declarations (AD) were also discussed by representative from the Netherlands, where terminologies may slightly vary so that coding AD would contribute to make them comparable and increase accuracy. It was pointed out that Appendix 2 of ISPM 12:2011 (revised) contains recommended terminologies for ADs, making this list the basis for coding ADs, e.g. "AD 1 *Thrips palmi*". This would also apply to all languages. Treatments coding was also presented by a representative from the Netherlands and reference was made to ISPM 12:2011 which includes a number of coding options. The UN/CEFACT already has codes for each type of treatment. *Codex Alimentarius* has a code list for active ingredients on pesticide residues, available on their website. The FAO team responsible for the official control of pesticides produced a list called Collaborative International Pesticides Analytical Council codes (CIPAC). Among all these available lists choice must be made as to which to use. There may be other pesticide/code lists (e.g. OECD) that should be also considered.

4. GROUP DISCUSSIONS: STANDARDIZATION REQUIRED TO FACILITATE WORLWIDE E-CERTIFICATION

Summary of the Group Discussions are outlined in the suggested topics for three IPPC working groups.

Working Group 1

1. Use of UNCEFACT SPS XML Schema to develop an ePhyto XML data map (subset of full UNCEFACT SPS Schema).
2. What are the mandatory/optional data elements for ISPM 12:2011:
    a. Determine the mandatory and optional data elements

b. Determine the status of issuance for phytosanitary certificates (issued, transmitted then withdrawn with no replacement, pending, or cancelled)
c. Consider how optional data elements, with no data (blank), will be handled
d. Consider process for re-export phytosanitary certificates.

Working Group 2

1. Determine a common terminology for describing the following in consignments:
    a. weight and/or volume
    b. category and sub-class
    c. additional descriptions (height, etc.)
    d. common name
    e. variety (outside of ISPM 12:2011)
    f. regulated articles
    g. other import data.
2. Identify standardized lists for:
    a. country names-ISO codes (with some exceptions that would need standardization)
    b. botanical names (determine the source and how modifications or amendments are made, this should be a simple process accessible to all users)
    c. treatments types, including chemicals
    d. pest names
    e. additional declarations (not absolutely required for ePhyto, but will greatly facilitate the process).

Working Group 3

1. Determine methods for data transfer, how to establish security measures, and how data will be validated.

4.1. Development of an Exchange Mechanism

A representative from the Netherlands presented the piloting methods employed for ePhyto transfer and authentication in their pilot arrangements with several countries. Success principles for The Netherlands were the utilization of adopted standards and leveraging knowledge from other countries experienced in electronic certification (primarily with New Zealand and Australia). It was highlighted that the 'digital signature' is the equivalent of a signature stamp, but it is not like the electronic image.

The following key points were introduced with regard to purpose of the 'digital signature'/ digital authentication:

1) determining and authenticating the XML i.e. the content and who authorized the ePhyto (equivalent to signature);
2) how to prevent loss of integrity;
3) ensuring non-repudiation; and
4) how to achieve 1, 2, and 3, above throughout the validity and lifecycle of the certificate. It was highlighted that this concept of authentication replaces the stamp and signature on the paper certificate.

A representative from Australia presented their experiences in using electronic certification in animal and plant exports. The Australian experience reinforced findings by The Netherlands; the difference between export certification processes and electronic certificate message transmission was reiterated. The approach of pilots was beneficial in providing opportunities for flexibility, but in order to fully implement it, approval of decision-makers and engagement of technical experts are essential. Some concern was raised regarding the apparent bilateral

approach to implementing ePhyto and eCertification as a whole. The presenter conveyed that this approach was necessary due to the lack of an internationally accepted standard and limited capacity for electronic exchange of trading partners. In the future, a multilateral approach will be facilitated by the work following this meeting.

Practical experiences of implementing electronic certification for a veterinary example were presented by representative from the Netherlands. Significant knowledge was leveraged from Australia and New Zealand. An example of this was the XML, the ultimate solution for implementation was a pragmatic one based from previous knowledge of The Netherlands and other countries exchanging electronically. Similar to previous presentations, pilots to test systems, protocols, and functions were an essential part of the success.

A participant from New Zealand presented the concept of electronic signature and provided with a list of potential requirements for consideration by the participants and future working groups. These requirements include a more flexible and optional solution; the need to maintain data integrity, and that of the NPPO; and the need to facilitate a multilateral approach. These requirements may be particularly important for countries heavily focused on exports. The presenter mentioned that the Netherlands has become a leading expert in this area and encouraged its engagement in the Working Group. It was stressed again that the 'digital signature', or authentication, replaces the stamp and signature block on the paper certificate.

Mr Nico Horn (resource person from The Netherlands) outlined several potential implementation challenges for electronic phytosanitary certificates both for export and re-export trading. In cases of re-exported trade requiring phytosanitary certification, both the original phytosanitary certificate (or certified copy) and the phytosanitary certificate for re-exporting are submitted to the importing NPPO. When countries start to exchange information electronically they must follow an international standardization or enter into a bilateral arrangement.

In instances where the original phytosanitary certificate for export is on paper and the phytosanitary certificate for re-export is in an electronic format, a scanned copy, attached to the electronic certificate is sufficient. In the opposite situation where the original phytosanitary certificate for export is in an electronic format and the phytosanitary certificate for re-exporting in on paper, the solutions are not so clear. A pragmatic option is to consider the ePhyto document as a certified copy authorized by the NPPO of the re-exporting country. Concerns were raised as to the requirement for additional software, but the suggestion of the verified/authorised e-copy was also taken in due consideration. Significant discussions on this issue led to the unanimous consensus on the need for a harmonized approach.

4.2. **Discussion Groups for an Effective Exchange Mechanism**

After the discussion groups, the OEWG agreed on the following topics for future working groups (there are some questions the various working groups will needs to resolve), based on list above.

<u>Working Group 3</u>

1. Data security
    a. NPPOs are responsible for their servers' security and contingency plans for commodity pathway disruptions and outage management system (no need to standardized)
    b. Downtime notifications.
2. Authentication

a. Designate an authority (not a person)
b. Standardize encryption format
c. Build on existing standards
d. Keep in mind the legal aspects
e. Define common terminology (perhaps adopt digital evidence rather than digital signature)
f. Maintain flexibility for change – make recommendations for minimum standards
g. Involvement of Plant and IT experts.

3. Transmission
    a. Harmonized business model
    b. Pull or Push transmission - need to be standardized?
    c. Open Source technology.
4. Exchange Protocol
    a. An example of such an international standard is SOAP.

Additional topics for Working Group 1:

a. Versions of XML Schema (UNCEFACT) and all other standardized mechanisms (e.g. encryption, exchange protocol, etc.) that are specific to ePhyto (Group 1)
b. Agreed timeline to change/adopt on new version (and/or process for schema change).

The proposed deadline for recommendations by the working groups is 31 December 2011. The results will be included in a draft appendix to ISPM 12:2011. This appendix will follow the standard approval process and should be adopted in 2013.

4.3. **Next Steps and Establishment of WGs**

Although some of this assignment has already been undertaken, it is necessary to continue to harmonize all relevant processes, codes and business rules through the IPPC forum. The OEWG agreed on the establishment of three IPPC working groups:

- Working Group 1: IPPC XML Schema and ISPM 12:2011 mapping;
- Working Group 2: Harmonization of ISPM 12:2011 Code Lists; and
- Working Group 3: Harmonization of Data Exchange and Security Protocols (see Appendix 2 for potential membership). This represents the starting point of a process which will ultimately result in an Appendix on ePhyto to ISPM 12:2011.

The IPPC Secretariat will issue an official call for experts for the participation in these working groups. The deadline for nominations will be close of business on Friday 24 June 2011. Nominations need to be made by the IPPC contact points and should include the IPPC "Commitment Form" (counter signed by the nominee's supervisor) and a CV highlighting relevant experience.

The Secretariat noted the three working groups to be established by Friday 10 June 2011 and that the OEWG participants volunteering to join the WGs, would also establish a work programme and time schedule plan (considering the overall deadline of 31 December 2011) – see Appendix 1. It is expected that these working groups would be working virtually as there are no resources for face-to-face meetings. Each working group will need to elect a leader/facilitator who will be responsible for taking the WG work plan forward.

The ePhyto Steering Committee will continue to function to ensure the activities move forward and provide advice or guidance as necessary.

The IPPC Secretariat will establish a working area on the IPPC website for these WGs that will be password protected. However, it was agreed that IPPC contact points would also have 'read-only" access to ensure maximum transparency. The work area would provide a virtual place where to share documents and have a discussion forum, with the aim of to facilitating communication and allowing members to keep track of all activities.

5. CONCLUSIONS OF THE OEWG

The OEWG outlined a common understanding of ePhyto in terms of scope, processes and areas that need to be addressed further. There was a consensus on the establishment of three working groups with the objectives of developing the electronic equivalent of the phytosanitary certificate as detailed in ISPM 12:2011 (including certification for re-export).

The challenge will be to carry this momentum forward over the next 6 – 12 months. This will ultimately determine the success and impact of the OEWG.

IPPC Secretariat representative reiterated his gratitude to the Republic of Korea for hosting the meeting in such an organized manner and to the Government of New-Zealand for providing financial support, as well as to the Steering Committee for the overall organization. He also stressed the importance of the OEWG, which most likely will be extremely beneficial to the implementation of ePhyto due to the diversity of participants, in nationality, expertise, eCertification knowledge, and thanks to their significant contribution.

Korea representative expressed his pleasure in coordinating the workshop and was impressed by the level of engagement of all participants. They all look forward to ensuring the implementation of the work programme as established by the OEWG. . Korea also noted that should the need arise; they would be willing to host further IPPC meetings.

Egypt offered to host a second OEWG in the following year to maintain momentum and finalize the achievements of the three working groups.

Appendix 1

Work Plans and Schedule of Activities of the Three IPPC ePhyto Working Groups

Working Group 1: XML Schema

Topics:

1. Use of UN/CEFACT SPS XML Schema to develop a e-Phyto XML data map/Schema (subset of full UN/CEFACT SPS Schema)
2. What are the mandatory/optional data elements for ISPM 12:2011?
    a. Determine mandatory and optional elements
    b. Status of issuance (issued/transmitted then withdrawn with no replacement, pending, cancelled, common terminology)
    c. How do we handle optional data elements with no data (blank)?
    d. How do we handle re-export phytosanitary certificates?

Additional items for Working Group 1:

a. Versions of XML Schema (UNCEFACT) & all other standardized mechanisms (e.g. Encryption, exchange protocol, etc.) that are specific to ePhyto (Group 1)
b. Agreed timeline to change/adopt new version (and/or process for schema changes).

Group Leader:	**Martin Boerma, NL**
Back-up Group Leader:	Peter Johnston, NZ
Members	Time Zones (based on GM Time):
Martin BOERMA	+1
Seiki JUN	+9
Barbara COOPER	+10
Ana Maria ORBETA GREEN	-4
Craig SOUTHWICK	-7
Sheryn KIRKPATRICK PAPINEAU	-5
Peter JOHNSTON	+12

Activities:

1. **Group communications**
    - set up a sharepoint (Craig Southwick)
    - members to advise Craig Southwick of MS Office version by 17th of June 2011
    - Once agreed, move to IPP
2. **Produce an agreed "Generic Minimum Data Map"**
    - Comparison and alignment of existing data maps of COSAVE, Australia, Netherlands, Korea, NAPPO, and New Zealand – including mandatory/optional determinations
    - Responsibility: NL
    - WG1 members to provide existing data maps to NL two weeks following IPPC's confirmation of group membership
    - NL timeline: August 15th (to be confirmed)
    - NL to distribute the results of the comparison to WG1 members
    - WG1 members to consider results of NL comparison and respond to NL by 1 September 2011
    - Produce a WG1 agreed aligned data map by 15 September 2011
    - Posting on IPP

- Approach WG2 and obtain info/code sets for insertion into the XML structure (inclusion on ePhyto)
- Amend draft data map
- Produce final data map.

3. Define a generic business model for certificate issuances status

- Australia to circulate an initial draft using existing BRS for eCertification with terminologies modified for phytosanitary purposes. Deadline by 25 July 2011 (to be confirmed).

3.1 Define and confirm options for managing re-export situations

This was to be follow-up after the meeting through e-mail or virtual meetings.

4. Define the process and options to manage amendments to the ePhyto data map

This was to be follow-up after the meeting through e-mail or virtual meetings.

Working Group 2: Harmonisation of ISPM 12 code lists

Group leader:	**Nico Horn**
Assistant:	Fitzroy White

Members of Sub-group A - Botanical Names (capture common names against) and pest names

Nico Horn (facilitator)	n.m.horn@minlnv.nl
Fitzroy White	fswhite@moa.gov.jm
Salah Yousseff	salah.yousseff@gmail.com
Josiah Syanda	jsyanda@kephis.org; jsyanda@gmail.com
David Nowell	Dave.nowell@fao.org
J.A.Oluitan	jeremiaholuitan@yahoo.co.uk
Olusola Wintola	winsol2004@yahoo.co.uk
Paola Cabrera Hickmann	paola.cabrera@sag.gob.cl
Takahara Shinichi	takaharas@pps.maff.go.jp
J.P. Singh	j.p.singh@nic.in
Chortip Saiyapongse	annsalya@yahoo.com

Members of Sub-group B - Treatments

Salah Yousseff (facilitator)	salah.yousseff@gmail.com
Bev Beacham	Bev.beacham@aqis.gov.au
Chortip Saiyapongse	annsalya@yahoo.com
Elvin A. Carandang	elvincaran@yahoo.com

Members of Sub-group C - Additional Declarations

Nico Horn (facilitator)	n.m.horn@minlnv.nl
Bev Beacham	Bev.beacham@aqis.gov.au
Luis Leonel Espinoza Lopez	luis.espinoza@senasica.gob.mx
Fitzroy White	fswhite@moa.gov.jm

Members of Sub-group D - Product Description: Categories and Subclasses

Bev Beacham (facilitator)	Bev.beacham@aqis.gov.au
J.P. Singh	j.p.singh@nic.in
Paola Cabrera Hickmann	paola.cabrera@sag.gob.cl
Olusola Wintola	winsol2004@yahoo.co.uk
Takahara Shinichi	takaharas@pps.maff.go.jp

Activities of each Sub-group:

- which lists are needed?
- who to update the lists?
- where to publish the lists?

Time Schedule:
Draft recommendations to be issued by the 30th October 2011.

General issues:

- Country names (ISO)
- Weight Volume
- Additional description (e.g. height)

- Common name
- Variety
- Regulated articles
- Other import data

Bev Beacham should submit a proposal

Further discussion:

- Inclusion of HS code sets

Working Group 3: Methods for transfer, security measures, validation

Pre-activities measures

- Designate an authority (not a person)
- Build on existing standards
- Involvement of Plant and IT experts
- Open source technology
- Maintain flexibility for change – make recommendations for minimum standards
- NPPOs are responsible for their servers' security and contingency plans for commodity pathway disruptions and outage management system (no need to standardize).

Activities

1. **Security**

   Notification of downtime

2. **Authentication**

   a. Standardize Encryption format
   b. Keep in mind the legal aspects
   c. Define a common terminology (perhaps adopt digital evidence rather than digital signature)

3. **Transmission**

   a. Harmonized business model (UN/CFACT)
   b. Pull or Push transmission - need to be standardized?

4. **Exchange Protocol**

   Agree on a standardized process e.g. SOAP

5. **Starting Point**

   Harmonized Business model (Lex Moret to provide an overview of the business model).

Appendix 2

Draft List of Participants for Each Working Group

Below is a preliminary list of proposed participants for each working group. Attendance will be subject to formal nomination and commitment by countries.

Group 1: XML Schema

• Seiki Jun (Korea, Republic of) • Martin Boerma (Netherlands) • Peter Johnston (New Zealand)	Other representatives from: • Australia • Canada • Chile • COSAVE • Egypt • Mexico • Turkey • United States

Group 2: Code Standardization

• Bev Beacham (Australia) • J.P. Singh (India) • Fitzroy White (Jamaica) • Shinichi Takahara (Japan) • Josiah Syanda (Kenya) • Nico Horn (Netherlands) • Oluitan J.A. (Nigeria) • Wintola Olusoia (Nigeria)	Other representatives from: • Canada • COSAVE • Egypt • Korea, Republic of • Mexico • Philippines • Thailand • Turkey • United States

Group 3: Security and Transmission

• Lex Moret (Netherlands) • Guy Watt (UK)	Other representatives from: • Australia • Canada • India • Mexico • New Zealand • Norway • Turkey • United States

Appendix 3

OEWG PARTICIPANTS LIST

Seoul, Korea
7–10 June 2011

Countries

Country	Name/ Role	Email address
Australia	**Bev BEACHAM** (Ms) Plant Export Operations Branch Biosecurity Services Group Australian Quarantine and Inspection Service	Bev.beacham@aqis.gov.au
Australia	**Julie WEYMOUTH** (Ms) Biosecurity Services Group Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry	Julie.Weymouth@aqis.gov.au
Belgium	**Lode MAES** (Mr) FAVV Controlebeleid S6: Stafdirectie Integratie van BedrijfsInformatie (SIBI)	LODE.MAES@favv.be
Canada	**Sheryn KIRKPATRICK-PAPINEAU** (Ms) Plant Health and Biosecurity Canadian Food Inspection Agency	sheryn.kirkpatrick@inspection.gc.ca
Chile	**Ana María ORBETA GREEN** (Ms) Head of Subdepart.Informatic	ana.orbeta@sag.gob.cl
Egypt	**Salah YOUSSEF** (Mr) First Undersecretary, Head of Agriculture Services and Follow Up Sector Ministry of Agriculture and Land Reclamation	salah.yousseff@gmail.com
India	**J. P. SINGH** (Mr) Deputy Director (Ento.) Govt. of India, Ministry of Agriculture National Plant Quarantine Station	j.p.singh@nic.in
Jamaica	**Fitzroy WHITE** (Mr) Senior Plant Quarantine/SPS Enquiry Point Officer	fswhite@moa.gov.jm
Japan	**Motoi SAKAMURA** (Mr) Director, Operation Department Kobe Plant Protection Station Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries	sakamuram@pps.maff.go.jp
Japan	**Shinichi TAKAHARA** (Mr) Senior Officer Yokohama Plant Protection Station, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries	takaharas@pps.maff.go.jp
Kenya	**David MBARANI** (Mr) IT Department Nairobi	dmbarani@kephis.org

Country	Name/ Role	Email address
Kenya	**Josiah SYANDA** (Mr) Plant Inspection Unit, JKIA Nairobi	jsyanda@kephis.org jsyanda@gmail.com
Malaysia	**Arizal bin ARSHAD** (Mr) Principal Assistant Director SPS and International Standards Unit, Crop Protection and Plant Quarantine Division Department of Agriculture Kuala Lumpur **Yusliana Abd. RAHIM** (Ms) Information Technology Officer ICT Section Plannnig and ICT Division Department of Agriculture Putrajaya	arizal@doa.gov.my arizac1470@gmail.com yusliana@doa.gov.my
Mexico	**Lic. Roberto BETANZOS FUENTES** (Mr) Jefe del Departamento de Soluciones Informáticas. Dirección General de Administración e Informática Dirección de Tecnologías Senasica	roberto.betanzos@senasica.gob.mx;
Mexico	**M. C. Luis Leonel ESPINOZA LÓPEZ** (Mr) Especialista Agropecuario en Certificación Fitosanitaria. Dirección General de Sanidad Vegetal Dirección de Regulación Fitosanitaria Senasica	luis.espinoza@senasica.gob.mx
Netherlands	**Martin BOERMA** (Mr) Manager CLIENT Food and Consumer Product Safety Authority Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality	Martin.boerma@vwa.nl
Netherlands	**A.J. MORET (Lex)** (Mr) Projectmanager Client International ICT services Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality	a.j.moret@minlnv.nl
New Zealand	**Peter JOHNSTON** (Mr) Principal Adviser Plant Exports, Import & Exports Standards | Standards Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry	peter.johnston@maf.govt.nz
Nigeria	**Olusola WINTOLA** (Mr) Plant Pathologist Nigeria Plant Quarantine Service Moor Plantation Ibadan	winsol2004@yahoo.co.uk
Nigeria	**J.A. OLUITAN** (Mr) Plant pathology/ Entomologist Officer in charge of export certification and issuance of Phytosanitary Certificate	jeremiaholuitan@yahoo.co.uk
Norway	**Per BRATTERUD** (Mr) IKT-Stab The Norwegian Food Safety Authority	Per.Bratterud@mattilsynet.no

Country	Name/ Role	Email address
Philippines	**Elvin A. CARANDANG** (Mr) Plant quarantine officer Plant Quarantine Service Bureau of Plant Industry	elvincaran@yahoo.com
Singapore	**Chua Lay HAR** (Ms) Agri-Food & veterinary Authority of Singapore	Chua_Lay_Har@ava.gov.sg
Singapore	**Doris SIM** (Ms) Agri-Food & veterinary Authority of Singapore	SIM_Peh_Ee@ava.gov.sg
Thailand	**Chortip SALYAPONGSE** (Ms) Senior Agricultural Scientist Export Plant Quarantine Service Group, Office of Agricultural Regulation, Department of Agriculture	annsalya@yahoo.com
Turkey	**Songül AKAR** (Ms) Agricultural Engineer Plant and Plant Products Border Control Division	songula@kkgm.gov.tr
Turkey	**Hüseyin DİKCİ** (Mr) Computer Engineer General Director of protection and control	hdikci@kkgm.gov.tr
UK	**Guy WATT** (Mr) Senior Plant Health and Seeds Inspector The Food and Environment Research Agency	guy.watt@fera.gsi.gov.uk
US	**Craig SOUTHWICK** (Mr) Program Manager US Department of Agriculture US Department of Agriculture Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service Plant protection and Quarantine	Craig.Southwick@aphis.usda.gov
US	**Michael PERRY** (Mr) Export Specialist US Department of Agriculture Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service Plant protection and Quarantine Phytosanitary Issues Management Export Services	Michael.J.Perry@aphis.usda.gov
Vietnam	**Nguyen Quang HIEU** (Mr) Senior Plant Quarantine Official Plant Quanrantine Division Plant Protection Department- Ministry of Agriculture and rural Development	hieukdtv@yahoo.com.vn
Korea, Republic of (*host country*)	**Young-Chul JEONG** (Mr) Deputy Director International Quarantine Cooperation Division National Plant Quarantine Service	ycjeong9@korea.kr
Korea, Republic of (*host country*)	**Kyu-Ock YIM** (Ms) Researcher International Quarantine Cooperation Division National Plant Quarantine Service	koyim@korea.kr

Country	Name/ Role	Email address
Korea, Republic of (*host country*)	**Cheon-Sun LEE** (Ms) Deputy Director Pest Survey & Control Division National Plant Quarantine Service	lch6009@korea.kr
Korea, Republic of (*host country*)	**Youn-Yong SHIN** (Mr.) Assistant Director Pest Survey & Control Division National Plant Quarantine Service	nolbukorea@korea.kr
Korea, Republic of (*host country*)	**Seiki JUN** (Ms) Assistant Director Quarantine & Planning Division National Plant Quarantine Service	seiki.jun@gmail.com
Korea, Republic of (*host country*)	**Hongsook PARK** (Ms) Inspector Jungbu Regional Office National Plant Quarantine Service	hspark101@korea.kr

Regional Organizations

Region	Name/ Role	Email address
COSAVE	**Paola CABRERA HICKMANN** (Ms) Encargada de los sistemas informáticos del Subdepartamento de Defensa Agrícola y Forestal Servicio Agrícola y Ganadero (SAG) Chile	paola.cabrera@sag.gob.cl
NAPPO	**Rebecca LEE** (Ms) Technical Director North American Plant Protection Organization Ottawa, Canada	Rebecca.lee@nappo.ca suamena@yahoo.ca

Resources Persons

Country	Name/ Role	Email address
Australia	**Barbara COOPER** (Ms) Director - Certification Management Group Australian Quarantine and Inspection Service	Barb.Cooper@aqis.gov.au
Netherlands	**Nico HORN** (Mr) Team Manager International Affairs Division Plant Plant Protection Service of the Netherlands	n.m.horn@minlnv.nl

IPPC Secretariat

Country	Name/ Role	Email address
Italy	**David NOWELL** (Mr) Acting Coordinator IPPC Secretariat Vialle delle Terme di Caracalla Rome	Dave.Nowell@fao.org